

1 Gary M. Hoffman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 2 Kenneth W. Brothers (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 3 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN
 4 & OSHINSKY LLP
 5 2101 L Street, NW
 6 Washington, DC 20037-1526
 7 Telephone: (202) 785-9700
 8 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

9 Edward A. Meilman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 10 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN
 11 & OSHINSKY LLP
 12 1177 Avenue of the Americas
 13 New York, New York 10036-2714
 14 Telephone: (212) 835-1400
 15 Facsimile: (212) 997-9880

16 Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715
 17 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008
 18 ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUBIN & DEMAIN
 19 177 Post Street, Suite 300
 20 San Francisco, California 94108
 21 Telephone: (415) 421-7151
 22 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064

23 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

24
 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

28 RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

29 Plaintiff,

30 v.

31 AEROFLEX ET AL.,

32 Defendants.

33 Case No. CV-03-4669-MJJ (EMC)

34 RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO
 35 DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
 36 LEAVE TO AMEND THEIR
 37 ANSWERS AND
 38 COUNTERCLAIMS

39 Date: December 13, 2005

40 Time: 9:30 a.m.

41 Courtroom: 11, 19th floor

42 Judge: Martin J. Jenkins

1 The Motion by the Defendants for leave to belatedly amend their Answers and
2 Counterclaims for a fourth time should be denied.¹ Not only is the Motion predicated on the
3 wrong legal standard, ignoring the Ninth Circuit's and Federal Rules requirement for a showing
4 of good cause by the moving party, but the proposed amendments are unnecessary, futile, unduly
5 delayed, based on facts previously known by Defendants at an earlier time when they amended
6 or had a right to amend, require additional discovery and are unduly prejudicial to Ricoh.
7
8
9

10 **I. NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS**

11 Plaintiff, Ricoh Company, Ltd. ("Ricoh") commenced this action in Delaware on
12 January 21, 2003 and the Defendants filed Answers and Counterclaims on March 12, 2003
13 (Delaware Docket Nos. 1, 16, 18-22). They amended their Answers and Counterclaims on April
14 9, 2003 (Delaware Docket Nos. 35-41), and then again on July 30, 2003 (Delaware Docket Nos.
15 95-100).

16 While the case was still pending in Delaware, Ricoh propounded interrogatories and
17 document requests on May 30, 2003 seeking to obtain further information about the Defendants'
18 defenses and to identify the products in issue by trade name or trade designation, to which the
19 Defendants responded on June 30, 2003.

20 Neither the Defendants' March 2003 Answers and Counterclaims, April 2003
21 Amended Answers and Counterclaims, July 2003 Second Amended Answers and Counterclaims
22 nor their response to discovery in June 2003 asserted an estoppel affirmative defense, a defense
23 based on 28 U.S.C. § 1498 and/or a defense based on 35 U.S.C. § 286.

24 The case was transferred to this Court from Delaware in August 2003. This Court
25
26

¹ While the Motion and proposed order headings include the companion *Synopsys v. Ricoh* case
(C03-2289 MJJ), the Motion is not concerned with any aspect of that case.

1 issued a Scheduling Order in March 2004 which set a deadline for amending the pleadings of
2 July 19, 2004 (Docket No. 122, page 2). Ricoh filed an Amended Complaint on April 12, 2004
3 and the Defendants filed an Answer to the Amended Complaint with counterclaims on May 26,
4 2004 (Docket Nos. 164 and 176-181). The Defendants' pleadings in response to the Amended
5 Complaint did not contain any assertions with regard to estoppel, § 1498 or § 286.

6 Discovery continued until May 2004 when, at the request of the Defendants,
7 discovery was stayed. Discovery reopened on July 22, 2005 and is currently scheduled to close
8 on January 27, 2006, less than one month after the hearing date on the instant Motion. The
9 parties have negotiated an extension and a proposed stipulated order is being submitted to the
10 Court for consideration and approval.

11 Defendants first presented Ricoh with a request to stipulate to the further amendment
12 to assert an estoppel affirmative defense, a defense based on 28 U.S.C. § 1498 and a defense
13 based on 35 U.S.C. § 286, on October 25, 2005. Their request did not assert that any of the facts
14 underlying these new defenses had not been available to the Defendants before the filing of
15 either their original Answer or any of their prior amendments, or there were any newly
16 discovered facts or set forth any explanation for their delay (Fink Decl., Exhibit A). After Ricoh
17 declined to stipulate, this Motion was brought.

18

19

20 **II. ARGUMENT**

21 The Defendants' request to amend their Answers and Counterclaims for a fourth time
22 should be denied. The Defendants have not made the showing of good cause required by the
23 Ninth Circuit and Federal Rules, nor could they do so.

24

25 **A. Defendants Failed To Make The Required Showing Of Good Cause**

26

27 The Defendants' Motion is based on solely on applying the liberal standard for

28

1 amending pleadings (“freely given”) of Fed. R. Civ. P. 15, and throughout their submission, they
2 assert that Ricoh has not shown why the amendment should be denied. However, this Court
3 issued an scheduling order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 which gave the parties until July 19,
4 2004 to amend their pleadings (Docket No. 122, page 2). Rule 16(b) provides that “a schedule
5 shall not be modified except upon a showing of good cause....” As a result, the liberal Rule 15
6 standard is no longer applicable and any request to amend the pleadings requires a showing of
7 good cause by the movant. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 608 (9th Cir.
8 1992) (once an order establishes a time table for amending pleadings, Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 controls,
9 not Fed. R. Civ. P. 15). The burden of showing good cause is on the party seeking to amend,
10 which here is the Defendants, not Ricoh.

11 The Defendants have not made a showing of good cause, and in fact they have not
12 even tried to submit one. On this basis alone, the Motion can be denied.

13

14

15 **B. Good Cause Could Not Have Been Shown
Even Had Defendants Tried To Do So**

16 Leave to amend is not automatic even under the liberal standard of Rule 15 but the
17 Court must consider whether there are any relevant factors including undue delay, bad faith or
18 dilatory motive, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by previous amendments, undue prejudice
19 and futility, *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962), albeit each of those factors need not be
20 given equal weight, *Bonin v. Cilderon*, 59 F.3d 815, 845 (9th Cir. 1995) (futility alone can justify
21 denial of a motion to amend). See, *Ascon Properties, Inc. v. Mobil Oil Co.*, 866 F.2d 1149, 1160
22 (9th Cir. 1991). Under the good cause standard of Rule 16, at least the same factors should be
23 considered, particularly since the burden of show “good cause” is obviously much higher. The
24 Defendants’ Brief identifies four changes in the proposed amended pleadings. As will now be
25 shown, a consideration of the relevant factors show there is no good cause for permitting any of
26 these changes.

27

28

1

2 **1. The Proposed § 1498 Defense Addition Has Not Been Shown To Be Prima**
 3 **Facie Valid, Is Facially Futile, Adds A New Issue, Requires Additional**
 4 **Discovery, And Is Unduly Prejudicial**

5 The most significant change in the proposed amendment is to add an affirmative
 6 defense based on 28 U.S.C. § 1498 which prohibits damages from sales of products made to or
 7 for the United States under certain circumstances. Section 1498 concerns use or manufacture by
 8 or for the United States and explicitly requires such use or manufacture as being undertaken
 9 “with the authorization or consent of the Government” (28 U.S.C. § 1498(a), second paragraph).
 10 Authorization or consent can be explicit or can be implied. *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. U.S.*, 29 Fed.
 11 Cl. 197, 223 (Ct. Cl. 1993). Lack of authorization or consent has been found where the activity
 12 was not required by the Government’s contract specifications or by the Government’s
 13 contracting officer. *See, e.g. Carrier Corp. v. United States*, 534 F.2d 244, 248 (Ct. Cl. 1976).
 14 Whether the defendants were acting within the “authorization and consent” of the Government is
 15 a factual determination. *Williams v. Columbia Broadcasting Systems, Inc.*, 57 F. Supp. 2d 961,
 16 966 (C.D. Cal. 1999).

17 Defendants have not even made a rudimentary attempt to present facts showing there
 18 was even a remote possibility that the required authorization and consent exists as to one or more
 19 of them.² Consequently, this proposed new defense is on its face deficient, and leaves this Court
 20 with no choice other than to consider it to be a futile defense.

21 Since “authorization and consent” is a fact specific determination, discovery is
 22 essential, as the Motion concedes (page 4, lines 16-17). To raise this issue at such a late date
 23 (November 2005), based on a new defense theory that requires additional discovery when the

24

25 ² While the moving papers imply the § 1498 defense is applicable to all of the Defendants, their
 26 discovery responses reflect that none made sales to the U.S. Government and that only Aeroflex
 27 made any sales to other companies that might have made sales to the U.S. Government. And, in
 28 any event, the responses have no bearing on whether or not any such activity was authorized as
 required.

1 Defendants had the underlying factual information at their hands for years, is highly prejudicial
 2 to Ricoh, since Ricoh has been seeking to advance this case to trial since its filing in January
 3 2003. The Courts have long recognized that prejudice is especially likely to exist if an
 4 amendment involves a new theory or requires additional discovery. *See, e.g., Bell v. Allstate Life*
 5 *Ins. Co.*, 160 F.3d 452, 454 (8th Cir. 1998) (prejudice found when issues raised by proposed
 6 amendment involve new factual and legal issues and required additional discovery); *United*
 7 *States ex rel. Schumer v. Hughes Aircraft Co.*, 63 F.3d 1512, 1527 (9th Cir. 1995), *vacated on*
 8 *other grounds*, 520 U.S. 939 (1997) (undue 3 year delay and prejudicial new theories support
 9 denial).

10 The need for additional discovery is even more prejudicial here because Ricoh has
 11 exhausted its available interrogatories against all Defendants during the almost 3 years this case
 12 has been pending and hence, this avenue of discovery is closed to Ricoh.

13 Still further, prejudice is apparent from the fact that there is a six year limitation on
 14 recovery of damages under 35 U.S.C. § 286. Jurisdiction over Section 1498 cases lies with the
 15 Court of Claims. If Ricoh is forced to start anew in that court today, it will have lost the right to
 16 recover damages for infringement during the current 3 year period of pendency of the present
 17 lawsuit.

18 The cases cited by Defendants are not to the contrary. Either they applied Rule 15,
 19 which is not applicable here, or the issue had already been the subject of discovery and the
 20 applicability of Section 1498 had been considered albeit not formally pled, also not applicable
 21 here. For instance, in *TM Patents v. IBM*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 352, 354 (S.D.N.Y. 2000), the court
 22 granted leave to amend where discovery had already taken place and the court had already
 23 considered a motion for summary judgment on the issue of liability for sales to the Government
 24 and specifically held that § 1498 applied.

25 The reasons discussed in this section were identified to the Defendants prior to their
 26 bringing this Motion (see Fink Decl., Exhibit B), and Defendants decided not to even try in its
 27 moving papers to make any good faith *prima facie* showing of authorization or consent.

1 Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that, should the Defendants now attempt in their reply
 2 papers to submit the showing they decided not to make when presenting this motion, the Court
 3 should not permit Defendants to resort to such tactics to blindside Ricoh, and should refuse to
 4 consider any such belatedly-proffered submission.

5

6 **2. The Other Proposed Changes Are Unnecessary**

7 The other three of the four proposed revisions of Defendants' pleadings are simply
 8 unnecessary and do not justify amendment.

9 As to the first of these revisions, Defendants state that "the proposed amended
 10 Answer merely shortens the paragraphs that describe the [invalidity and laches] defenses" and
 11 "merely clarify" the previously pleaded affirmative defenses (Motion, page 2). Since those
 12 defenses have already appeared in the Defendants' pleadings, there is no need for this change.
 13 *See, Texaco v. Ponsoldt*, 939 F.2d 794, 798-99 (9th Cir. 1991) (affirming denial of leave to
 14 amend to present "new claims ... merely clarifying earlier claims"). Moreover, the proposed
 15 elimination of the specification of what constitutes these defenses opens the pleadings to other
 16 previously undisclosed theories, requiring more discovery and at a time when Ricoh cannot
 17 propound interrogatories. Moreover, it is not comprehensible how removing the explanation of
 18 the basis for these defenses will "merely clarify" such claims without causing prejudice.

19 The second proposed change, the estoppel defense, is asserted to have two aspects.
 20 The first is that it is based on facts already stated in the prior pleading of laches (Motion, page 2,
 21 lines 8-9), which means change is clearly unnecessary. Moreover, all of the Defendants have
 22 admitted in responses to interrogatories that they were unaware of the patent-in-suit prior to
 23 being sued. This admission means there could not have been any reliance or change of position,
 24 making this proposed change futile since the estoppel defense can never succeed. As a matter of
 25 hornbook law, estoppel is dependent on a showing of actual reliance on the patent owner's
 26 inaction in enforcing the patent. The second aspect is asserted to be based on prosecution history
 27

1 estoppel, which Defendants state has already been litigated in this case (Motion, page 2, lines 11-
2 13). While Defendants failed to tell the Court to what they are referring, it appears they mean
3 consideration of history when considering scope of the claims, and in that connection, the Court
4 has already issued a Markman ruling (Claim Construction Order, Docket No. 296) after looking
5 at the prosecution history to the extent the Court felt appropriate. Since the Court has already
6 applied prosecution history estoppel to the extent necessary, this additional pleading of estoppel
7 is also unnecessary.

8 Moreover, these two changes necessarily require additional discovery.

9 The third unnecessary change is to add a statute of limitations affirmative defense,
10 which the Defendants justify as merely conforming the pleadings to the agreement by the parties
11 (Motion, page 3, lines 13-20). Clearly, there is no need to amend the pleadings to reflect an
12 agreement by the parties. If any action were needed, the Court can handle that as a single line in
13 the final pretrial order. Also, during discovery, the Defendants have not provided any
14 information which could be used to construct a basis for damages based on something prior to
15 the statute of limitations, and therefore as a practical matter, Defendants gain nothing by
16 pleading this defense.

17

18 **3. There Has Been Undue Delay**

19 The Defendants filed their original Answers and Counterclaims on March 12, 2003.
20 Pursuant to F. R. Civ. P. 11, the Defendants had an obligation to investigate whether or not they
21 had a basis for raising various defensives. Presumably, they did so. The new defenses sought to
22 be added by the now proposed amended answers were not part of the original Answers and
23 Counterclaims. Nor were they part of the two amendments to those pleadings which were made
24 before this case was transferred from Delaware.

25 After transfer, this Court gave the Defendants until July 19, 2004, 14 months after
26 their original pleadings, to amend their pleadings, and in fact, the Defendants did so in May
27

1 2004. During those 14 months, discovery was ongoing, and the Defendants had ample time to
 2 consider whether there was a basis for adding new defenses. But once again, the new allegations
 3 now proposed to be added were omitted from Defendants' amended pleadings.

4 It is now more than 2 and 1/2 years after the Defendants' original pleadings and about
 5 1 and 1/2 years after their most recent amendment to their pleadings. All of the "facts" on which
 6 the proposed amendments are based have always been in the sole possession of the Defendants –
 7 they have never needed anything from Ricoh or any third party to seek leave to make this
 8 amendment. Clearly, there has been an undue delay after having an adequate opportunity to
 9 amend.

10 A delay this long requires the moving party to show it was based on "oversight,
 11 inadvertence or excusable neglect," *Whitaker v. City of Houston*, 963 F.2d 831, 836 (5th Cir.
 12 1992). The Defendants have made no effort to do so. Also, since the Defendants have failed to
 13 make any effort to rebut the fact that they had reason to know the basis for the assertions now
 14 sought to be made, it is respectfully submitted that the Court must assume the Defendants had
 15 knowledge of the facts but chose not to plead them. These failures by Defendants provide more
 16 than sufficient reasons to deny leave to further amend. *See Kalpan v. Rose*, 49 F.3d 1363, 1370
 17 (9th Cir. 1994) (previous amendment, coupled with delay and movant's prior knowledge of facts
 18 and legal theories, justified denial); *Westlands Water Dist. v. Firebaugh Canal*, 10 F.3d 667, 677
 19 (9th Cir. 1993) (party bypassed previous opportunity to amend); *Texaco v. Ponsoldt*, 939 F.2d at
 20 799 (affirming denial of leave to amend one year after knowledge of facts); *Jackson v. Bank of
 21 Hawaii*, 902 F.2d 1385, 1388 (9th Cir. 1990) (eight month delay between time when facts were
 22 known or should have been known and time of request to amend the complaint was
 23 unreasonable).

24 The Defendants have already pleaded their case four times. They have not tried to
 25 excuse their long delay. This additional, late and prejudicial attempt to amend should not be
 26 permitted. *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton*, 833 F.2d 183, 186 n.3 (9th Cir. 1987) (court has
 27 broad discretion to deny motion when one or more opportunities to amend have been provided).

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 For all of the foregoing reasons, Defendants Motion for Leave to Amend their
3 Answers and Counterclaims should be denied.

4

5

6 Dated: November 16, 2005

Ricoh Company, Ltd.

7 By: 
8 Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715
9 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008
10 Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Rubin & Demain
11 177 Post Street, Suite 300
12 San Francisco, California 94108
13 Telephone: (415) 421-7151
14 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064

15 Gary M. Hoffman
16 Ken Brothers
17 Eric Oliver
18 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
19 OSHINSKY LLP
20 2101 L Street NW
21 Washington, D.C. 20037-1526
22 Telephone: (202) 785-9700
23 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

24 Edward A. Meilman
25 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
26 OSHINSKY LLP
27 1177 Avenue of the Americas
28 New York, New York 10036
29 Telephone: (212) 896-5471
30 Facsimile: (212) 997-9880

31 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

1 Gary M. Hoffman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 2 Kenneth W. Brothers (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 3 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN
 4 & OSHINSKY LLP
 5 2101 L Street, NW
 6 Washington, DC 20037-1526
 7 Telephone: (202) 785-9700
 8 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

5 Edward A. Meilman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 6 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN
 7 & OSHINSKY LLP
 8 1177 Avenue of the Americas
 9 New York, New York 10036-2714
 10 Telephone: (212) 835-1400
 11 Facsimile: (212) 997-9880

12 Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715
 13 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008
 14 ALTSCHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUBIN & DEMAIN
 15 177 Post Street, Suite 300
 16 San Francisco, California 94108
 17 Telephone: (415) 421-7151
 18 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064

19 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273
 1274
 1275
 1276
 1277
 1278
 1279
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288
 1289
 1290
 1291
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302
 1303
 1304
 1305
 1306
 1307
 1308
 1309
 1310
 1311
 1312
 1313
 1314
 1315
 1316
 1317
 1318
 1319
 1320
 1321
 1322
 1323
 1324
 1325
 1326
 1327
 1328
 1329
 1330
 1331
 1332
 1333
 1334
 1335
 1336
 1337
 1338
 1339
 1340
 1341
 1342
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346
 1347
 1348
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352
 1353
 1354
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358
 1359
 1360
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364
 1365
 1366
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370
 1371
 1372
 1373
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377
 1378
 1379
 1380
 1381
 1382
 1383
 1384
 1385
 1386
 1387
 1388
 1389
 1390
 1391
 1392
 1393
 1394
 1395
 1396
 1397
 1398
 1399
 1400
 1401
 1402
 1403
 1404
 1405
 1406
 1407
 1408
 1409
 1410
 1411
 1412
 1413
 1414
 1415
 1416
 1417
 1418
 1419
 1420
 1421
 1422
 1423
 1424
 1425
 1426
 1427
 1428
 1429
 1430
 1431
 1432
 1433
 1434
 1435
 1436
 1437
 1438
 1439
 1440
 1441
 1442
 1443
 1444
 1445
 1446
 1447
 1448
 1449
 1450
 1451
 1452
 1453
 1454
 1455
 1456
 1457
 1458
 1459
 1460
 1461
 1462
 1463
 1464
 1465
 1466
 1467
 1468
 1469
 1470
 1471
 1472
 1473
 1474
 1475
 1476
 1477
 1478
 1479
 1480
 1481
 1482
 1483
 1484
 1485
 1

1 On November 8, 2005, Defendants' Motion For Leave To Amend Their Answers
2 And Counterclaims was filed. The matter, having been fully briefed, came before the Court on
3 December 13, 2005.

4 The motion, the memoranda, and supporting evidence of the parties having been
5 considered, and oral argument having been heard, the Court DENIES Defendants' Motion For
6 Leave To Amend Their Answers And Counterclaims.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED
9

10 DATED: _____

11 The Honorable Martin J. Jenkins
12 United States District Court Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28